

COMPARISON BETWEEN CANLITE STABILIZED LATERITE AND  
PROBASE STABILIZED LATERITE

NG TECK WEI

A project report submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirement for the award of degree of  
Master of Engineering (Civil)

Faculty of Civil Engineering  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JUNE 2014

*This project report is dedicated to my late father and beloved mother*

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to express my sincere and deepest gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Nor Zurairahetty for all her limitless efforts in guiding, encouraging, supervising throughout my research work and for providing me useful reference materials. Besides, I would like acknowledge her generosity in spending time I needed for consultation, reading and responding to the drafts of my work. Thank You!

I am very grateful to Mr. Yong Chin Yung for his positive comments and giving me relevant reference documents which are very helpful to success this research. Special thanks go to Probase Manufacturing Sdn Bhd who supplied the Probase soil stabilizers and Mr. Nima Latifi who provide me the Canlite soil stabilizer.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my mother, my friends and all who contributed to this research work in one way or another. They contributed to this work through their generous encouragement, understanding and love.

## ABSTRACT

In the previous studies, the unconfined compressive strength (UCS) of Laterite soil was improved significantly by adding polymer soil stabilizers like Canlite and Probase. Although this is the important finding of the research, there is still no comparison study done between the two polymer soil stabilizers. The aim of this paper is to investigate the effectiveness of the Laterite soil stabilization treated by Canlite-liquid and Probase-liquid soil stabilizer. A testing programme, scheduled to achieve the overall objectives of this study was to determine the basic properties of Laterite soil, establish the relationship between the compaction characteristics (maximum dry density and optimum moisture content) with the amount of polymer emulsion and last but not least compare the strength of the Canlite-treated and Probase-treated Laterite soil. The effects of both polymer soil stabilizer – Canlite and Probase were examined. The optimum moisture content of the mixtures was used as a reference to determine the water content for preparing all the specimens and later used in unconfined compressive strength (UCS) test. The laboratory test results showed that the additional amount of Canlite and Probase improved the physical properties, liquid limit and unconfined compressive strength (UCS) of Laterite soil. The compressive strength of the treated Laterite was varied and depends on the type of stabilizers, quantity of additives and curing time. From the UCS tests, it was found that the Probase improve the greater strength of the Laterite as compared to the Canlite.

## ABSTRAK

Dalam kajian sebelum ini, ujian kekuatan mampatan tak terkurung (UCS) tanah laterit telah bertambah baik dengan ketara dengan menambah penstabil tanah polimer seperti Canlite dan Probase. Walaupun ini merupakan penemuan penting dalam penyelidikan, masih tiada kajian perbandingan dilakukan antara kedua-dua penstabil tanah polimer. Tujuan kertas ini adalah untuk melihat keberkesanan penstabilan tanah Laterit dirawat oleh Canlite-cecair dan Probase-cecair penstabil tanah. Satu program ujian, yang dijadualkan untuk mencapai objektif keseluruhan kajian ini adalah untuk menentukan sifat-sifat asas tanah laterit, menentukan hubungan antara ciri-ciri pemadatan (ketumpatan kering maksimum dan kandungan lembapan optimum) dengan jumlah emulsi polimer dan akhir sekali bandingkan kekuatan tanah Canlite dirawat dan Probase dirawat Laterit. Kesan kedua-dua penstabil tanah polimer - Canlite dan Probase telah diperiksa. Kandungan lembapan optimum campuran telah digunakan sebagai rujukan untuk menentukan kandungan air untuk menyediakan semua spesimen dan kemudian digunakan dalam kekuatan mampatan tak terkurung (UCS) ujian. Keputusan ujian makmal menunjukkan bahawa tambahan Canlite dan Probase meningkatkan sifat-sifat fizikal, had cecair dan kekuatan mampatan tak terkurung (UCS) tanah laterit. Kekuatan mampatan Laterit yang dirawat bergantung kepada jenis penstabil, kuantiti bahan tambahan dan masa sembuhan. Daripada ujian UCS, didapati bahawa Probase meningkatkan kekuatan yang lebih besar kepada Laterit berbanding dengan Canlite.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	<b>DECLARATION</b>	<b>ii</b>
	<b>DEDICATION</b>	<b>iii</b>
	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>iv</b>
	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>v</b>
	<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>vi</b>
	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>vii</b>
	<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>x</b>
	<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xi</b>
	<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>xiv</b>
	<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	
	1.1 Research Background	1
	1.2 Problem Statement	3
	1.3 Aim and Objectives	4
	1.4 Scope of Research	5
<b>2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	
	2.1 Laterite Soil	6
	2.2 Soil Stabilization	9

2.2.1 Chemical Stabilization	11
2.3 Traditional Stabilizer	11
2.3.1 Lime	13
2.3.2 Cement	15
2.3.3 Fly-Ash	17
2.3.4 Blast Furnace Slags	18
2.3.5 Bitumen and Tar	19
2.4 Non-traditional Stabilizer	23
2.4.1 Polymer Emulsion	25
2.4.1.1 Canlite	30
2.4.1.2 Probase	32
2.5 Selection of Stabilizing Agent	34
<b>3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	
3.1 Introduction	35
3.2 Laboratory Test	37
3.3 Atterberg Limits Test	38
3.3.1 Liquid Limit	41
3.3.1.1 Test Procedures for Liquid Limit by Using Fall Cone Method	43
3.3.2 Plastic Limit	45
3.3.2.1 Test Procedures for Plastic Limit Test	46
3.4 Standard Proctor Compaction (SPC) Test	47
3.4.1 Test Procedures for SPC Test	49
3.5 Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) Test	51
3.5.1 Test Procedures for UCS Test	52
3.6 Specimen Preparation	53

<b>4</b>	<b>DATA AND ANALYSIS</b>	
	4.1 Introduction	56
	4.2 Soil Classification	56
	4.3 Compaction Characteristic	65
	4.4 Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) Test	68
	4.4.1 Effects of Polymer Quantities	70
	4.4.2 Effects of Curing Time	73
	4.4.3 Comparison between Canlite and Probase Stabilizer	75
<b>5</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
	5.1 Introduction	78
	5.2 Conclusions	79
	5.3 Recommendations	81
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>82</b>
	<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>89</b>



**LIST OF TABLES**

<b>TABLE NO.</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
2.1	Summarize of traditional soil stabilizers	22
2.2	Summarize of non-traditional soil stabilizers	24
3.1	Mix proportioning for the samples in the UCS test	37
3.2	Typical values of LL, PL and activity of some clay minerals	40
3.3	The plasticity index in a qualitative manner	40
3.4	General relationship of consistency and unconfined compressive strength of clays	52
4.1	Summary of Atterberg limits test	61
4.2	SPC test results for natural Laterite soil	67
4.3	Summary of UCS test result	68

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Relationship between unconfined compressive strength and lime content of the treated soils with lime	14
2.2	Change in the compaction curve of a lime treated soil	15
2.3	Unconfined strength of the cement-treated soil samples with different content and curing time	17
2.4	Relationship between the maximum dry density and tar content	20
2.5	Relationship between the optimum water content and tar content	21
2.6	Unconfined compressive strength of tar-stabilized clayey sand	21
2.7	Effect of acrylic polymer on the UCS	26
2.8	Effect of Soil Sement on the Eolian soil	27
2.9	Effect of Soil Sement on the Fluvial soil	27
2.10	Unconfined compressive strength value for 28 days of curing	28
2.11	Canlite - SS299	30
2.12	Strength gain for SS299 treated Laterite soil with different stabilizer content and curing time	31

2.13	Comparison for UCS of SS299 treated Laterite soil with different stabilizer content and curing time	31
2.14	Probase TX-85	33
2.15	Strength gain for TX-85 treated Laterite soil with different stabilizer content and curing time	33
3.1	Research framework	36
3.2	Atterberg limits	38
3.3	Plasticity index	39
3.4	Plasticity chart	41
3.5	Fall cone test	42
3.6	Sample plot of moisture content vs cone penetration for determination of liquid limit	43
3.7	Plastic limit test	46
3.8	SPC test results for silty clay	48
3.9	Typical compaction curve for four soils	49
3.10	Unconfined compression strength test	51
3.11	Sample wrapped with a cling film and cured in the container	54
3.12	Samples put together in large container	54
3.13	Repeatability data for UCS test of untreated sample	55
4.1	Penetration against moisture content for natural Laterite soil	57
4.2	Penetration against moisture content with 2% Canlite	58
4.3	Penetration against moisture content with 8% Canlite	58
4.4	Penetration against moisture content with 16% Canlite	59
4.5	Penetration against moisture content with 2% Probase	59
4.6	Penetration against moisture content with 8% Probase	60

4.7	Penetration against moisture content with 16% Probase	60
4.8	Graph of liquid limit versus percentage of stabilizers	62
4.9	Graph of plastic limit versus percentage of stabilizers	62
4.10	Graph of plasticity index versus percentage of stabilizers	63
4.11	Atterberg limits of Canlite-treated Laterite	64
4.12	Atterberg limits of Probase-treated Laterite	65
4.13	Compaction curve for natural Laterite soil	67
4.14	Failure modes of the specimens after UCS test	70
4.15	Effect of Polymer content on the UCS of the Canlite-treated Laterite	71
4.16	Effect of polymer content on the UCS of the Probase-treated Laterite	71
4.17	Effect of curing time on Canlite-treated Laterite	73
4.18	Effect of curing time on Probase-treated Laterite	74
4.19	Comparison chart for UCS of 2% polymer-treated Laterite	76
4.20	Comparison chart for UCS of 8% polymer-treated Laterite	76
4.21	Comparison chart for UCS of 16% polymer-treated Laterite	77

**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

UCS	=	Unconfined Compressive Strength
CBR	=	California Bearing Ratio
SPC	=	Standard Proctor Compaction
MDD	=	Maximum Dry Density
OMC	=	Optimum Moisture Content
CMS	=	Cement-Modified Base
CTB	=	Cement-Treated Base
GGBFS	=	Ground Granulated Blast Furnace Slag
PVC	=	Polyvinyl Chloride
SS299	=	Canlite
TX-85	=	Probase
US	=	Untreated Sample
PL	=	Plastic Limit
LL	=	Liquid Limit
PI	=	Plasticity Index
UU	=	Unconsolidated, Undrained

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
A	Data of Atterberg limits test	90
B	Result of standard proctor compaction test	97
C	Examples of computer-generated report for UCS results	98

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Research Background**

The use of soil is an inevitable element in the construction process, especially for developing countries. It is used extensively as construction materials in the building of roads, dams, embankments and airfields. According to Whitlow (2001), the properties of the materials need to be measured and evaluated before use and introduce some quality control measures to ensure a quality product. In this sense, it is worth to realize that the strength of the soils varies from different types of soils. Indeed, there are a wide variety of soils in Malaysia; one of the special soils is called Laterite soils.

Laterite soils are found abundantly in the Tropicana country such as Malaysia. The colours can differ from ochre through red, brown, violet to black, depending largely on the concentration of iron oxides (Amu et al., 2011a). Laterite soil is well known in Asian countries as a building material for more than 1000 years and the temples at Angkor are famous examples for this early use. Basically, Laterite soils are regarded as good foundation materials as they are virtually non-swelling (Alhassan, 2008). However, it contains amount of clay minerals that its strength and

stability could not be guaranteed under loads, especially under presence of water (Oluremi et al., 2012). When Laterite soil consists of highly plastic clay, the plasticity of soil may cause cracks and damage on building foundations, pavement, highway or any other construction projects. It is therefore important, to understand the behaviour of Laterite soil and thus figure out the method of soil stabilization.

The soil stabilization can be either mechanical or chemical stabilization. The former refers to either compaction or the introduction of fibrous and other non-biodegradable reinforcement to the soil while the latter is the method of improving the engineering properties of soil by adding some chemical to improve the existing soil. The used of stabilized soils in construction like road construction has been introduced since Roman times (Krebs and Walker, 1971) and used in construction of adobe buildings in Cyprus and Arizona (Fitzmaurice, 1958). It has a very long history and common practice around the world. When the mechanical stability of a soil cannot be obtained and considered, it is always an alternative by adding of the chemical additives. For instance, addition of traditional chemical stabilizer such as lime, cement, bituminous materials and fly ash were done by many researchers (Oluremi et al., 2012; Alhassan, 2008; Little et al., 2000; Rogers et al., 1993; Sherwood, 1993; Ola, 1975).

Despite of traditional chemical stabilizer, polymer emulsion which is considered non-traditional chemical stabilizer has introduced recently like PolyPavement, Soil Sement, TerraBond, Canlite, Probase, etc. Principally, the function of polymers is to enhance the strength of the soil and it is especially suitable to increase the strength of silty-sand soil under wet and dry condition (Yong, 2013). Among the polymer emulsions, Canlite and Probase was studied by many researchers recently such as Latifi et al., (2013); Marto et al., (2013) and Yong, (2013) in respect of Laterite stabilization.



In this study, both polymer soil stabilizer entitled Canlite and Probase were tested to the Laterite soil. Both Canlite and Probase exist in two forms which are liquid and powder form; however, only liquid form was used in this research. The results obtained from the UCS test for both polymer soil stabilizers were then compared and discussed.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

Laterite soil is found to be good construction materials and can be easily available in the Malaysia. For instance, it can be used as building materials for moulding blocks and plastering. Beyond that, it can be utilized in a variety of construction purposes such as highway construction and pavement construction. However, the Laterite soil in the natural has low bearing capacity and low strength due to high content of clay. Many research found that the construction failure are owing to poor Geotechnical properties of the underlying soils (Laterite soil). For example, several highway pavements on Nigeria roads are failing due to the inadequate of soil strength (Amu et al., 2011b). This soil stabilization is practiced when it is more economical to improve its engineering properties rather than bring in the one that fully complies with the requirement of the specification for the soil (Ola, 1975).

Different additives have different functions and can bring different effect to the same materials. The addition of cement will increase the compressive strength of the Laterite soil, but probably produce shrinkage cracks when the cement content is high; addition of coconut husk ash increase the California Bearing Ratio (CBR) value of the Laterite soil but reduces the plasticity index of the Laterite soil.

For the non-traditional stabilizers, polymer emulsions can be used on most soils; however, certain products are more effective for specific soil types. For instance, when synthetic polymer emulsions applied at low application rates (sprayed-on or mixed-in) to the surface of the unbound roads, they perform well for dust suppression. They bond soil particles together and so reduce dust generation. Another example is synthetic polymer emulsions can be used to stabilize soils at higher application rates (Kestler, 2009). In the previous studies, the Laterite soil was treated with both Canlite and Probase and the research found that the unconfined compressive strength (UCS) of Laterite soil was improved significantly. Although this is the important finding of the research, there is still no comparison study done between the two polymer soil stabilizers. It is always advisable that does not rely only on one material and should go for alternatives. This is because the comparison study can search for the best solution. Thus, comparison study between the Canlite-treated soil and Probase-treated soil is vital for the construction industry.

### **1.3 Aim and Objectives**

The aim of this paper is to investigate the effectiveness of the Laterite soil stabilization treated by Canlite-liquid and Probase-liquid soil stabilizer. In this paper, three objectives were identified to attain the above aim:

- a. To determine the basic properties of Laterite soil.
- b. To establish the relationship between the compaction characteristics (maximum dry density and optimum moisture content) with the amount of polymer emulsion.
- c. To compare the strength of the Canlite-treated and Probase-treated Laterite soil.

## 1.4 Scope of Research

Generally, this research is a comparison study of the stabilization of Laterite soil between the use of Canlite and Probase soil stabilizer. Physical properties tests like Atterberg limits Test was carried out while mechanical properties tests were standard protocol compaction (SPC) test and unconfined compressive strength (UCS) test. All the tests were performed in accordance with the British Standard 1377 (1990) and Head (1992).

For the constant variables, there were settings as follow:

- a) The soil sample was obtained around the Faculty of Electrical and Electronic, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia Skudai Johor;
- b) Only the soil particles which passed through the 2mm sieve were considered in the laboratory test;
- c) The amounts of Probase and Canlite soil stabilizer were added to the Laterite soil were 2%, 8% and 16%, besides, there were a condition which no soil stabilizer added to the sample soil as control samples;
- d) All the treated soil samples were cured for 3, 7 and 28 days.

For the laboratory test procedure, there were carried out as follow:

- a) All the soil specimens were dried out in the oven (approximately 110 °C) for one day before laboratory work were carried out.
- b) A standard proctor compaction test was carried out to achieve the maximum dry density (MDD) and optimum moisture content (OMC).
- c) The soil samples for unconfined compressive strength (UCS) test were prepared by referring to the MDD and OMC of the untreated soil.
- d) UCS tests were carried out after curing period of 0, 3, 7 and 28 days with different emulsion content.

## REFERENCES

- AASHTO M-145-91. (2008). Classification of Soils and Soil-Aggregate Mixtures for Highway Construction Purposes. *American Association of State and Highway Transportation Officials*.
- Ahnberg, H., Holm, G. (1999). Stabilization of Some Swedish Organic Soils with Different Types of Binders. *Proceeding of Dry Mix Methods for Deep Soil Stabilization*, pp. 101-108.
- Alhassan, M. (2008). Permeability of Laterite Soil Treated with Lime and Rice Husk Ash. *Technical Report*, Vol. 12(2), pp. 115-120.
- Al-Tabbaa, A., Evans, W. C. (2005). Stabilization-Solidification Treatment and Remediation: Part I: Binders and Technologies-Basic Principal. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Stabilization/Solidification Treatment and Remediation*, pp. 367-385.
- Amu, O. O., Adetuberu, A. A. (2010). Characteristics of Bamboo Leaf Ash Stabilization on Lateritic Soil in Highway Construction. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology*, Vol. 2(4), pp. 212-219.
- Amu, O. O., Bamisaye, O. F., Komolafe, I. A. (2011a). The Suitability and Lime Stabilization Requirement of Some Laterite Soil Samples as Pavemen. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences and Technology*, Vol. 2(1), pp. 29-46.
- Amu, O. O., Ogunnlyl, S. A., Oladeji, O. O. (2011b). Geotechnical Properties of Lateritic Soil Stabilized with Sugarcane Straw Ash. *American Journal of Scientific and Industrial Research*, Vol. 2(2), pp. 323-331.

- ASTM D2166. Standard Test Method for Unconfined Compressive Strength of Cohesive Soil. *ASTM International*.
- ASTM D2487-11. Standard Practice for Classification of Soils for Engineering Purposes (Unified Soil Classification System). *ASTM International*.
- ASTM D4318. Standard Test Methods for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils. *ASTM International*.
- ASTM D698. Standard Test Methods for Laboratory Compaction Characteristics of Soil Using Standard Effort [12 400 ft-lbf/ft<sup>3</sup> (600 kN-m/m<sup>3</sup>)]. *ASTM International*.
- Atterberg, A. (1911). Über die physikalische Bodenuntersuchung und über die Plastizität der Tone (On the Investigation of the Physical Properties of Soils and on the Plasticity of Clays). *Internationale Mitteilungen für Bodenkunde, Band*, Vol.1, pp. 10-43.
- Blight, G. E. (1997). Mechanics of Residual soils. A.A Balkema, the Netherlands.
- British Standard 1377-1 (1990). Methods of Test For Soils For Civil Engineering Purposes. General Requirements and Sample Preparation. *BSI Group*.
- Buchanan, F. (1807). A Journey from Madras through the Countries of Mysore. *Kanara and Malabar. East India Co., London*.
- Burmister, D. M. (1949). Principles and Techniques of Soil Identification. *Proceedings, Annual Highway Research Board Meeting, National Research Council, Washington, D. C*, Vol. 29, pp. 402-433.
- Casagrande, A. (1948). Classification and Identification of Soils. *Transactions, ASCE*, Vol. 113, pp. 901-930.
- Cat. (2006). Understanding the Basics of Soil Stabilization: An Overview of Materials and Techniques. *Caterpillar*.
- CIRIA. (1995). Laterite in Road Pavements. Westminster, London. Special Publication 47 for Transport Research Laboratory (TRL).

- Cortellazzo, G., Cola, S. (1999). Geotechnical Characteristics of Two Italian Peats Stabilized with Binders. *Proceeding of Dry Mix Methods for Deep Soil Stabilization*, pp. 93-100.
- Das, B. M. (2010). Principles of Geotechnical Engineering, Seventh Edition. *Cengage Learning*.
- Fajobi, A. B., Ige, O. O., Adeleye, O. K. (2012). Engineering Properties of Acrylic Resin on Lime Stabilized Soil. *Transnational Journal of Science and Technology*, Vol. 2(11), pp. 113-127.
- Fitzmaurice, R. (1958). Manual on Stabilized Soil Construction for Housing. *Technical Assistance Programme, United Nations*, pp. 124.
- Garber, N. J., Hoel, L. A. (2000). Traffic and Highway Engineering, Second Edition *Brooks /Cole Publishing Company, London*, pp. 481- 492.
- German, C. M. (2005). Stabilization of Soft Clay Subgrades in Virginia Phase I Laboratory Study. Master Thesis Report, *Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*.
- Gidigas, M. D. (1976). Laterite Soil Engineering; Pedogenesis and Engineering Principles. *Developments in Geotechnical Engineering 9. Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, Amsterdam Oxford, New York*.
- Gow, A. J., Davidson, D. T., Sheeler, J. B. (1960). Relative Effects of Chlorides, Lignosulfonates and Molasses on Properties of a Soil-Aggregate Mix. *Bulletin 282, Highway Research Board, Washington, DC*.
- Head, K. H. (1992). Manual of Soil Laboratory Testing. Volume 1: Soil Classification and Compaction Tests, Third Edition. *Whittles Publishing*.
- Hicks, R. (2002). Alaska Soil Stabilization Design Guide.
- Hogentogler, C. A., Terzaghi, K. (1929). Interrelationship of Load, Road and Subgrade. *Public Roads*: pp. 37–64.
- Ingles, O. G., Metcalf, J. B. (1972). Soil Stabilization: Principles and Practice. *Butterworths, Sydney*.

- Katz, L. E., Rauch, A. F., Liljestrand, H. M., Harmon, J. S., Shaw, K. S., Albers, H. (2001). Mechanisms of Soil Stabilization with Liquid Ionic Stabilizer. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, Vol. 1757(1), pp. 50-57.
- Kestler, M. A. (2009). Stabilization Selection Guide for Aggregate and Native-Surfaced Low-Volume Roads. *The U.S. Department of Agriculture*.
- Krebs, R. D., Walker, R. B. (1971). Highway Materials. *McGraw Hill, New York*, pp. 428.
- Latifi, N., Marto, A., Eisazadeh, A. (2013). Structural Characteristics of Laterite Soil Treated by SH-85 and TX-85 (Non-traditional) Stabilizers. *EJGE*, Vol. 18, pp. 1707-1718.
- Little, D. N. (1995). Handbook for Stabilization of Pavement Subgrades and Base Courses with Lime. *Kendall/Hunt, Iowa*.
- Little, D. N., Nair, S. (2009). Recommended Practice for Stabilization of Subgrade Soils and Base Materials. *NCHRP, Web Only Document 144, Texas Transportation Institute, Texas A&M University College Station, Texas*.
- Little, L., Connor, B., Carlson, R. F. (2005). Tests of Soil Stabilization Products, Phase 1. *University of Alaska Fairbanks*.
- Little, D. N., Males, E. H., Prusinski, J. R., Stewart, B. (2000). Cementitious Stabilization, Transportation in the New Millennium: State of the Art and Future Directions. *Perspectives from Transportation Research Board Standing Committees*.
- Lyon Associationes, Inc. (1971). Laterite and Lateritic Soils and Other Problem Soils of Africa. Kumasi, Ghana.
- MacLaren, D. C., White, M. A. (2003). Cement: Its Chemistry and Properties. *Journal of Chemical Education*, Vol. 8(6), pp. 623.
- Maignien, R. (1966). Review of Research on Laterite, Natural Resource Research IV; UNESCO: Paris, France, pp. 148.

- Makusa, G. P. (2012). Soil Stabilization Methods and Materials in Engineering Practice. *State of the Art Review, Department of Civil, Environmental and Natural resources engineering, Division of Mining and Geotechnical Engineering*, Luleå University of Technology.
- Marto, A., Latifi, N., Sohaei, H. (2013). Stabilization of Laterite Soil Using GKS Soil Stabilizer. *EJGE*, Vol.18, pp. 521-532.
- Mitchell, J. K. (1993). Fundamentals of Soil Behaviors. Second Editions, *Wiley & Sons Inc, New York*.
- Naeini, S. A., Naderinia, B., Izadi, E. (2012). Unconfined Compressive Strength of Clayey Soils Stabilized with Waterborne Polymer. *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering*, Vol. 16(6), pp. 943-949.
- Newman, K., Tingle, J. S. (2004). Emulsion Polymers for Soil Stabilization. *FAA Worldwide Airport Technology Transfer Conference, Atlantic City, USA*.
- Ola, S. A. (1975). Stabilization of Nigeria Lateritic Soil with Cement, Bitumen and Lime. *Proceeding of 6<sup>th</sup> Regional Conference for Africa on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering. Durban, South Africa*.
- Oluremi, J. R., Adedokun, S. I., Osuolale, O. M. (2012). Stabilization of Poor Laterite Soil with Coconut Hush Ash. *International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology*, Vol. 1(8), pp. 1-9.
- Pandan, N. S., Nsgaraj T. S., Sivakuma Babu G. L. (1993). Tropical Clays. I: Index Properties and Microstructural Aspects. ASCE, Vol.119 (5).
- Pousette, K., Mácsik, J., Jacobsson, A. (1999). Peat Soil Samples Stabilized in Laboratory-Experiences from Manufacturing and Testing. *Proceeding of Dry Mix Methods for Deep Stabilization*, pp. 85-92.
- Probase. (2012). Probase. Making Roads Better. Probase Manufacturing. Retrieved November 28, 2013 from <http://www.probase.com.my>.
- Proctor, R. R. (1933). Design and Construction of Rolled Earth Dams. *Engineering News Record*, Vol.3.



- Rahmat, M. N., Ismail, N. (2011). Sustainable Stabilisation of the Lower Oxford Clay by Non-traditional Binder. *Applied Clay Science*, 52(3), 199-208.
- Raychaudhuri, S. P. (1980). The Occurance, Distribution, Classification and Management of Laterite and Lateritic Soils. *Journee Georges Aubert, New Delhi, India*.
- Reddy, K. (2002). Experiment 7- Atterberg Limits. Engineering Properties of Soils Based on Laboratory Testing, pp. 60-73.
- Rogers, C. D. F., Glendinning, S. (1993). Modification of Clay Soils Using Lime. In C. a. Rogers (Ed.), *Proceeding of the Seminar held at Loughborough University on Lime Stabilization*, pp. 99-114.
- Santoni, R. L., Tingle, J. S., Webster, S. L. (2003). Stabilization of Silty Sand with Non-traditional Additives. *Transportation Research Record 1787, TRB, National Research Council, Washington, DC*, pp. 33-41.
- Sherwood, P. (1993). Soil Stabilization with Cement and Lime. *State of the Art Review. London: Transport Research Laboratory, HMSO*.
- Sinha, S. P., Davidson, D. T., Hoover, J. M. (1957). Lignins as Stabilizing Agents for Northeastern Iowa Loess. *Proceedings of the Iowa Academy of Science, 69th Session, Iowa*.
- Skempton, A. W. (1953). The Colloidal Activity of Clays. *Proceedings, 3<sup>rd</sup> International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, London*, pp. 57-61.
- Thagesen, B. (1996). Tropical Rocks and Soils. In: Highway and Traffic Engineering in Developing Countries. *Thagesen, B. edition, Chapman and Hall, London*.
- Tingle, J. S., Santoni, R. L. (2003). Stabilization of Clay Soils with Non-traditional Additives. *In Transportation Research Record 1819. Transportation Research Board, Washington, DC*.
- Whitlow, R. (2001). Basic Soil Mechanics, Fourth Edition. *Pearson Education*.
- Yong, C. Y. (2013). Stabilization of Laterite Soil Using Canlite Soil Stabilizer. *Undergraduate Project Paper, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*.

Zelalem, A. (2005). Basic Engineering Properties of Lateritic Soils Found in Nejo – Mendi Road Construction Area, Welega. *A PhD thesis of Addis Ababa University, School Of Graduate Studies.*